

April 22, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2055

theory, unaware that they are but worshipping ancient idols in modern disguise. According to the Cincinnati Daily Gazette of January 3, 1879, Gen. (later President) James A. Garfield stated in an address in Chicago, to celebrate R-day (Resumption day, January 2, 1879):

We shall still hear echoes of the old conflict, such as the "barbarism and cowardice of gold" and the "virtues of fiat money," but the theories which gave them birth will linger among us like belated ghosts, and soon find rest in the political grave of dead issues \* \* \*.

General Garfield evidently respected the wisdom of our people too much to expect that a later generation, such as the present one, would not permit the theories advocating the "virtues" of fiat money to "rest in the political grave of dead issues." What General Garfield called a "periodical craze" swept over this country in 1971 and thereafter with a force apparently never before experienced by our people. The end of this great disease is not yet in sight. If past experience provides any worthwhile lessons, the ultimate consequences of our failure to stop this craze promise to be extremely painful. Conversely, if we rise to the challenge and put an end to this craze now, we shall solve the major part of the economic problems of our Nation, including the problems of runaway debt and runaway deficits. And we shall solve it in a painless, not to say pleasurable way.

#### LET'S NOT GIVE DEADLY STINGER WEAPONS TO TERRORISTS

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past week we have become acutely aware of the risks of terrorist attacks against American citizens at home and abroad. We are evacuating Americans from the Sudan, stepping up security at our airports, Embassies, and military bases. But at the same time, other actions of our Government could be placing Americans at even greater risk. In recent weeks the administration has begun sending guerrilla groups one of the most dangerous weapons on the market, the Stinger antiaircraft missile.

The Stingers have already gone to guerrillas involved in covert operations in Angola and Afghanistan as part of a new United States policy to offer more sophisticated weapons to the United States-supported guerrilla groups. The Stingers are on their way. But we have absolutely no control over their ultimate fate. The administration has no guarantee that these weapons will not be sold or stolen or transferred into the hands of terrorists seeking to retaliate against the United States. Imagine this weapon in the hands of a Mu'ammar Qadhafi. The state-of-the-art Stinger is deadly accurate, easy to

hide and operate, and can shoot down not only military aircraft but a commercial airliner.

How can we be sure these weapons, though shipped to guerrilla groups we might support, will not end up surreptitiously in the hands of Qadhafi and his allies, people who would like nothing better than a sophisticated and spectacular means of retaliation against the United States?

Screening devices and searches would pale into insignificance next to the very real threat that a terrorist could stand hundreds of yards from a runway and strike, kill hundreds of innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in the fight against giving deadly weapons to terrorists by sponsoring the resolution I have introduced with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCoin] to ban the transfer of Stingers to guerrilla and paramilitary groups.

#### U.N. MAJORITY USES DOUBLE STANDARD IN JUDGING UNITED STATES AND LIBYAN ACTIONS

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today frustrated, but not really surprised, by the requirement of the United States, Britain, and France to veto a resolution considered by the United Nations' Security Council yesterday to condemn the recent United States action against Libyan terrorists.

The resolution, did not mention events leading up to the United States action and instead mention Libya only as a victim of an armed attack by the United States.

This is simply another case in which the U.N. majority is using a double standard in practicing selective indignation over alleged abuses by the United States and other Western nations while so often overlooking outrages committed by Socialist and Communist countries.

Voting in favor of the resolution were such well-recognized nonaligned nations as Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, United Arab Emirates, and the Soviet Union.

Calling this group nonaligned is like being called ugly by a frog.

#### STINGER: THE TERRORISTS' DELIGHT

(Mr. AuCoin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AuCoin. Mr. Speaker, as we do our daily mile of trotting between the House Chamber and our offices, pause for a moment and look south. There you'll see passenger airliners climbing out from National Airport.

If a terrorist were standing beside you with a stinger antiaircraft missile on his shoulder, he could shoot any of those airplanes down. He could do it from more than 10 square miles of the Washington area, or from a comparable area in most of the world's major cities.

If terrorists get these missiles, every air traveler in the world will be at their mercy.

Terrorists don't have these missiles today. But tomorrow they could, with the administration's decision to give them to paramilitary forces in Afghanistan and Angola. Whatever the virtues of these groups, airtight control of their weapons isn't among them.

Transfer of Stingers to paramilitary forces is a terrorist's dream. It is dangerous and dumb. I invite you to join Mr. DURBIN and me in cosponsoring legislation to prohibit this transfer. If we don't stop it now, the time will come when we'll wish we had.

#### THERE IS A "STINGER" IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of Members were speaking of Stingers here a few minutes ago. Well, a few minutes ago before that the American people just got stung. We had a resolution pass this House by unanimous consent that has the effect of increasing the outside earnings that Members of Congress are allowed to make by \$7,500.

There was an end run around the committee process, an end run done around the procedure supposedly established on this floor for unanimous consent resolutions, to the floor. Supposedly, supposedly the rule that says that the minority leader has to be consulted, the minority whip has to be consulted, the majority leader has to be consulted, the majority whip, that the chairmen of the committees have to be consulted and the ranking member.

I understand those procedures were not followed, that in fact we have a resolution that passed this House that has the effect of increasing the earnings of the Members of this Congress substantially, passed here by unanimous consent and was done so by an end run.

#### REQUEST TO VACATE CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Mr. WALKER. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which House Resolution 427 was approved be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]?

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

H 2056

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 22, 1986

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from New York has objected, so therefore the gentleman from New York stands in favor of raising the outside earnings, with an end run, by \$7,500 for every Member of Congress.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Frankly, I am hearing this for the first time. And until such time as the proper authorities on both sides of the aisle can have an opportunity to talk about it, I will continue to object.

Mr. WALKER. That is the procedure under which we supposedly operate here, that we do get things cleared. They were not cleared.

So the gentleman has, in effect, helped to raise the outside earnings of Members of Congress by \$7,500. You will have to live with that.

## EXPLANATION OF OBJECTION

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would yield at this time to my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Well, I do not want to get into a quarrel with my colleague from Pennsylvania. But this is something that has come up very suddenly. I think people have made decisions. I am not necessarily saying I agree or disagree. What I am saying is that to make a unanimous-consent request when the Chamber is empty, before the principals have an opportunity to talk about this, I would continue to object.

I would ask my colleague from Pennsylvania that he talk to the leadership on his side, have the leadership on his side discuss it with the leadership on our side and let us see if we can resolve it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## WORLD FOOD DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 296) to designate October 16, 1986, as "World Food Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I have no problem with the resolution, but I do think an explanation is in order. The gentleman is

protecting the process that he says should not bring up a unanimous-consent resolution in a Chamber that is empty. When I asked unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings and allow the Members an additional \$7,500 in outside earnings, that is precisely the procedure that was used here a few minutes ago in order to pass the resolution. An empty Chamber was used, and nonconsultation with the appropriate people was used, and we had this thing passed without the appropriate clearances having been made.

□ 1240

And now what the gentleman is suggesting is, having done this end-run around the House, a chance to vacate that and get us back to neutral ground is in fact wrong. That is my problem. Precisely the situation that the gentleman protests is what was used to pass the resolution that is in fact, I think, a wrongful resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that what the gentleman would allow is to do is by unanimous consent to get us back to ground zero, and then bring the resolution up, as the gentleman has suggested, when there are people in the House and we can look at this thing.

There is no earthly reason why we should allow \$7,500 of increased earnings by Members of Congress to pass this body by unanimous consent, and yet that is what was allowed here just a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I have no response. I will just say what I said before. There are leaders on the gentleman's side of the aisle who were elected by the people on the gentleman's side and leaders on this side. I believe that that leadership, which I might add is excellent leadership for both sides, should have the opportunity to discuss it. I am certain that they can come back and do the same thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to do here, and I would have no objection.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is absolutely right. But those leaders were not consulted with. That is the problem. The procedures that the Speaker has laid out for unanimous-consent resolutions to be brought forward were in fact violated.

I have here a copy of it, and it says, frankly, that the unanimous consent can only be brought up when assured that the majority and minority leadership, the committee and subcommittee chairmen and the ranking minority members have no objection. That procedure, it is my understanding, was not followed here. That is the objection. The only way that we can get back to ground zero is to vacate the proceedings that violated that particular order, and then consult with the leadership and make certain that everybody gets consulted with. That is all I am trying to achieve. It is the

gentleman's objection that is standing in the way of achieving getting back to a relatively neutral position on this and so that the discussion can take place.

Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman will still object?

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I still object.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I simply would like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who is the chief sponsor of House Journal Resolution 595, to designate October 16, 1986, as "World Food Day."

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], for bringing this measure up at an early date in order to enable the administration, the Members of Congress, and our entire Nation to gather together in tribute and pay proper respects to World Food Day.

Mr. Speaker, events such as the "Live Aid" concert and the U.S.A. for Africa production of "We are the world" only in part document the incredible contribution thousands of Americans are making toward ending world hunger.

Since 1979, the National Committee for World Food Day, under the leadership of its chairwoman, Patricia Young, and the auspices of the World Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] has undertaken hundreds of projects and programs related to the world's hunger problem. Without world food day and the organizations involved with its celebration, the ground swell needed that made the massive media events possible would never have existed.

Yet, despite this outpouring of support, the problem of world hunger persists. A recent world bank study states that "since 1980 one-third of the population of 87 developing countries, 730 million people, did not eat enough to lead active working lives." And half, 340 million, "subsisted on a Diet that stunts growth and severely jeopardizes health." UNICEF informs us that every 24 hours 42,000 children under the age of 5 die as a result of hunger and related diseases.

April 22, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 4641

at expanding the VOA's ability to reach areas such as central Russia and to avoid jamming behind the Iron Curtain.

Large sums also have gone to such ventures as the creation of Radio Marti, a separate radio network under VOA direction that beams daily broadcasts to Cuba; increasing by 200,000 a year the number of American books put into foreign circulation; a new system to teach English to foreigners, and an Artistic Ambassadors program that selects a number of talented young American musicians to tour other countries, giving concerts and conducting classes.

But of all these projects, **WORLDNET** perhaps best illustrates the mix of "global village" technology, glossy packaging and sky's-the-limit thinking that Wick and other savvy media operators have brought to the task of putting the administration into the forefront of international propaganda efforts.

During the past 2½ years, through **WORLDNET** the U.S. government has been able to reach 30 countries to stage news conferences with such top officials as Secretary of State George P. Shultz and Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, to show foreign audiences live coverage of a congressional hearing, and to help American scientists and scholars talk with their colleagues in other lands.

When the leaders of several African countries threatened to boycott the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles, some were induced to change their minds after **WORLDNET** let them exchange views with Peter Ueberroth, organizer of the games, and Tom Bradley, the black mayor of Los Angeles.

Since last April, **WORLDNET** also has been transmitting two hours of regular programming each weekday to Western Europe, where cable TV systems make it available to more than 3.2 million European households and hotels. Viewers get a half-hour of news and a variety of other fare ranging from cultural programs to Washington sportscaster George Michael's "Sports Machine."

Similar daily programming in Spanish and Portuguese is scheduled to begin this spring to Latin America. And by late this year, **USIA** says it hopes to begin additional regional **WORLDNET** services to the Middle East, East Asia and Africa.

"The only problem with **WORLDNET** is that it's ahead of its time. The facilities don't yet exist in other countries to make full use of its potential," said Leonard Marks, who headed **USIA** under President Lyndon B. Johnson in the 1960s. "But it's the wave of the future. It's what all major countries someday will be using to tell their stories, and it's the United States that's showing them the way."

In addition to **USIA**, the administration's propaganda weapons include the Board for International Broadcasting, which since 1974 has administered the two "surrogate" radio operations established by the Central Intelligence Agency in the early 1950s: **Radio Liberty**, which broadcasts to the Soviet Union, and **Radio Free Europe**, aimed at Moscow's East European satellites.

But it is **USIA**, with its more wide-ranging functions, that is the center of the administration's web of propaganda activities. That has made Wick the most influential **USIA** director since the late Edward R. Murrow during the Kennedy administration.

Unlike the suave and sophisticated Murrow, Wick—a former lawyer, nursing home owner, band leader, movie producer and real estate investor—has the personal style of a rough-edged, lone-wolf Hollywood deal maker. He begins a newspaper interview by telling the reporter, "I have to say that a lot of the stuff that's been written

about me in the press was pretty scurrilous." Then he adds deadpan: "Why, some of it wasn't even true."

His fondness for one-liners has not interfered with his ability to translate his friendship with the first family into funding support once undreamed of in his traditionally cash-starved agency. Moreover, even people who disagree with his politics or dislike him personally concede that Wick understands the art of communication and has a natural instinct for innovation.

House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.), who has watched the **USIA** closely over the years, says: "Despite some overzealous rhetoric and some mistakes in his method of operation, Wick has done an extremely effective job of modernizing the agency. . . . No one has been more innovative and imaginative in waging the war of ideas."

Such praise hasn't been heard too often at an agency that long was scorned by the professional diplomats of the State Department and kept on a tight leash by Congress. Its charter, which stresses that the agency's mission is to inform people in other countries about the United States, has created innumerable internal conflicts over the years about what **USIA** could or couldn't do in furthering that goal.

"Under the Carter administration, for example, there was a tendency to deny the idea that **USIA** should advocate anything at all," recalled Stanton H. Burnett, a career officer who now oversees **USIA** programs as counselor of the agency. "The feeling was that we should function as a semi-news agency and a semi-entertainment agency but that in the realm of ideas we should be no more than a conveyor belt for every stripe of opinion."

Wick, while conceding there has been "something of a pendulum swing" away from that approach, insisted that his guiding principle at **USIA** "is to tell the world about America in all its diversity. It's simply not true that I came aboard as the chief apostle of a right-wing takeover and the chief subverting agent of a conspiracy to bend **USIA** and the Voice of America to our philosophy. There may be people who wanted to do that, but Congress had made it very clear that that's against the rules."

But he added, "Telling about America means telling people about America's foreign policy. Right now that policy is set by Ronald Reagan and if we're going to tell the story accurately, we have to make clear what President Reagan believes in and what his policies stand for. There may be people who don't like those policies, but that doesn't lessen our responsibility to explain them with forthright journalistic accuracy."

At the moment, Wick's attention is focused primarily on following up his January trip to Moscow, where he discussed plans for the cultural exchanges agreed to by Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at the Geneva summit last November.

The agreements, the only concrete result of the summit, call for reviving a series of U.S.-Soviet exchanges that were suspended after the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Reagan also proposed a new program of people-to-people exchanges financed on the U.S. side by private sector contributions.

At present, they are the only initiatives showing promise of progress in the drive to improve U.S.-Soviet relations, and **USIA** has the responsibility for implementing them.

#### DEATH OF CHIEF JUDGE H. CARL MOULTRIE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a truly outstanding

jurist, Chief Judge H. Carl Moultrie of the District of Columbia Superior Court, who recently died.

Judge Moultrie set an example of hard work and thoughtful deliberation in carrying out his duties. He maintained a full-bench schedule even after becoming chief judge in 1978. I know that his colleagues will miss his leadership and direction, and his city will miss his tireless devotion to home rule, but both his bench and his city are stronger for his work.

Mr. President, Judge Moultrie was appointed an associate judge of the superior court in 1972. Prior to that he had been a newspaper columnist, a probation officer, a business executive, and then a practicing lawyer for over 15 years. His activity in community service is unparalleled in the District of Columbia. He was active in church, fraternal, neighborhood, social, and criminal justice groups throughout the community and the Nation, was known to almost every citizen of the District of Columbia and has been honored by scores of local and national organizations. He was a past president of the D.C. branch of the NAACP, a board member of the American Lung Association and the D.C. Heart Association, and an active member of literally dozens of community groups.

He was a graduate of Lincoln University (1936) and Lincoln University Theological Seminary (1938). He earned an M.A. from New York University (1952) and a law degree from Georgetown University Law School (1956), numerous postgraduate certificates in the fields of business and law and an honorary doctor of laws from Lincoln University (1979).

Mr. President, I want to extend my sympathy to his widow, Sara, and his son, H. Carl II, as well as Judge Moultrie's two grandchildren, and to thank them for sharing this remarkable man with the community he loved.

#### STINGER POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill, S. 2286, which would simply require democratic resistance forces in Angola and Afghanistan to agree to the same security controls for Stinger missiles as we have with friendly NATO allies. Let me emphasize that this should not and cannot be construed as a vote for or against democratic resistance forces but for safeguards and security controls in a world increasingly threatened by terrorism. When Colonel Qadhafi says that he will export terrorism to America and "pursue U.S. citizens in their country and streets," we must protect ourselves.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent articles concerning topics of interest to all Americans. The first article is an editorial that appeared in the April 3, 1986, edition of the Los Angeles Times.

S 4642

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 22, 1986

It is titled "Stinging Peace Prospects" and is a very thoughtful analysis of the chilling considerations that the Stinger missile has when introduced into a specific region of conflict. This article also discusses the millions of dollars in weapons intended for the democratic resistance that have fallen into the hands of a vast black market.

The second article appeared in the April 16, 1986, edition of the Washington Post. This is titled "Truck Explodes Near AF Base West of Tokyo." It is likely that terrorist groups parked this truck outside the U.S. Air Force base to further export violence and destruction against U.S. targets. The article states that "The truck contained rocket launchers which detonated before launching. The quantity of launchers is presently unknown." What if these had been confiscated Stinger missiles, Mr. President?

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to read these articles, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 3, 1986]

## STINGING PEACE PROSPECTS

The next step in implementing the Reagan Doctrine apparently will be to place more sophisticated American weapons in the hands of the guerrillas around the world whom the President insists on calling "freedom fighters." That would be a terrible mistake.

Initial reports have suggested that the mujahideen fighting the Soviet invaders in Afghanistan, and Jonas Savimbi's UNITA guerrilla force fighting to overthrow the Marxist government of Angola in Southern Africa, would be the first beneficiaries of the new policy. Then, it is suggested, more such weapons would make their way to the contras seeking to overthrow the Marxist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua.

Among the top-line weapons under consideration for export to these groups is the Stinger surface-to-air missile, an anti-aircraft weapon that can seek out a target five miles away and up to an altitude of 4,500 feet. It would be particularly effective in downing helicopter gunships pursuing the guerrillas.

Advocates of the exports are convinced that the weapons would tilt the balance of war to the guerrillas. Perhaps. But even more certain would be an escalation of the wars. The Soviet Union, which supplies the governments in each of these nations, would have no choice but to send in deadlier weapons. However dim the prospect for negotiated settlements may be in these complex wars, that prospect would be all the dimmer with the introduction of these lethal missiles.

There is another chilling consideration. Especially in Afghanistan and at the bases in Pakistan that supply the guerrillas fighting the Soviet invaders in Afghanistan, there is slack security. Millions of dollars in weapons, intended for the resistance, already have fallen into the hands of a vast black market. Protection of a weapon of the value of a Stinger would be impossible. A great risk would arise that at least some of them would make their way into the hands of international terrorists. The Stinger is, as a recent report in the Christian Science Monitor pointed out, "the ultimate terrorist

weapon." They are easily hidden, easily transported, fired by a single person. No civil aircraft in the free world would be safe from them. And it is no comfort to say that it really doesn't matter because the Soviet version of the weapon, the SA-7B, already is widely available.

There has always been a need for caution by Washington in the support that it has given to the resistance in Afghanistan. Afghanistan lies along the Soviet border, and Moscow can always outmatch and outsupply more distant nations. The level of arms there should be appropriate to the maintaining of pressure for a settlement, not to the triggering of a further terrible escalation of that brutal invasion.

Angola is an entirely different matter. Washington tends to forget that the Cuban troops and advisers that are based in Angola are in large measure in response to the guerrilla war that has been mounted against the government. This is not a case of a nation held hostage by an invading force. The only invading force in Angola has been the army of South Africa, arrayed in support of Savimbi's guerrillas. There has been a commitment to a negotiated settlement breached not by Angola but by South Africa. The good faith of the Angolan government has been evident in its commercial ties to the United States that have assured the flow of its petroleum to the free world. Washington only squanders its power and corrupts its commitment to freedom in giving arms and comfort to the Savimbi guerrillas.

Introduction of the Stinger in the war in Nicaragua would risk even more serious consequences. The Sandinista regime in Managua has resisted activating the advanced fighter aircraft offered by its Soviet and Cuban allies, and a tacit weapons-technology lid has been placed on the war until now. But if the most advanced portable anti-aircraft missiles are handed over to the contras, an escalation of unpredictable consequences would be inevitable. The careful efforts of the Contadora nations to produce a permanent peace would be undermined, if not destroyed.

All three insurrections—in Afghanistan, in Angola and in Nicaragua—have in these days a new prospect for peaceful settlement. The impatience of those who somehow think that they can impose their will and their solutions should not be allowed, through the triggering of a new escalation, to shatter that prospect and to deepen the death and devastation of these wars.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1986]

## TRUCK EXPLODES NEAR AF BASE WEST OF TOKYO

TOKYO, April 15.—A truck with a five-tube rocket-launching device exploded in flames tonight near a U.S. Air Force base west of Tokyo, police and base officials said, and the fins of one projectile were found inside the base.

No injuries or damage to the base were reported.

A police official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said the explosion occurred at about 8:40 p.m. about a mile northeast of the base at Yokota, 21 miles from Tokyo.

He said it was not known if any rockets were launched from the truck.

Lt. Jim Reagan, a public affairs officer at Yokota, said security police found the fins of one rocket in an open area inside the base.

He said Japanese police reported that the vehicle, parked in a tea field, contained five rocket-launching tubes that were empty. He said base and Japanese police were investigating.

In Washington, Pentagon officials released a statement saying the truck that ex-

ploded had forged license plates. "The truck contained rocket launchers which detonated before launching. The quantity of launchers in the vehicle is presently unknown," the statement said.

No person or group asserted responsibility for the attack. Missile attacks last month were aimed at the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo and other buildings, including the main site of the summit meeting of industrial nations planned for Tokyo in May. Responsibility for those attacks was claimed by leftist radical groups opposed to the summit and to celebrations of the 60th anniversary of Emperor Hirohito's reign.

White House spokesman Larry Speakes said, "It's too early" to connect Libyan leader Col. Muammar Qadhafi with the Yokota attack.

The United States and Libya are in a military confrontation arising from terrorist attacks which Washington says were linked with the Qadhafi government.

## MITTS ACROSS THE SEA

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a sensitive and resourceful editor in my State, and to thousands of other generous Michiganites who recently showed America at its best. These folks reached across thousands of miles and put into the outstretched hands of poor children in a faraway land the prized possessions of their own childhood, so that those youngsters might have the stuff to make a dream come true. With their generous action, these Michiganites demonstrated beautifully how a caring spirit can transcend national divisions and ideological differences.

This spirit was demonstrated in a dusty city of 125,000 in the Dominican Republic named San Pedro de Macoris. The city has achieved considerable attention among sports fans in the United States because it has produced a remarkable—for its size—number of baseball players for the U.S. major leagues, more than a dozen. Last February, a story in the Detroit Free Press noted that those well-paid athletes come home to San Pedro in the off-season, some of them to fine homes they have built with their earnings. The story told how the big leaguers are heroes to the poor kids of San Pedro, and how their homes are symbols of what can be achieved with disciplined skill. So those kids play a lot of baseball, too—with a passion, with a fire to get good enough to become another Pedro Guerrero or Joaquin Andujar or Pedro Gonzalez. But they have little more than passion—no mitts, no real bats, no horsehide balls. They protect their catching hands with cardboard and cans, swing away with tree limbs and table legs at rubber balls bound with rubber bands. It's enough to make even a tough editor in Detroit blink in sympathy.

And, back in Detroit, in February, such an editor did blink, and think. Neal Shine, the managing editor of The Detroit Free Press, thought back to his own childhood, when he and his friends played baseball on the street or in a vacant lot, and dreamed of

April 18, 1986

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 1265

which also has problems with Jerusalem and with Israel's borders, takes the logical position of recognizing Israel within its 1967 frontiers, and declaring the disputed territories subject to negotiation. Alone among West European states, the Vatican rejects this approach and refuses to recognize Israel.

Why? For the Vatican, the existence of a reborn Jewish state is perhaps theologically and certainly politically problematic. In part it is a question of numbers; there are a hundred million Arabs and only 4 million Israelis. The Vatican, to which the practice of *Realpolitik* has never been very foreign, can count. There are 21 Arab states, some with sizable Christian minorities. The Jews have one state only.

That state did not merit a mention at the Rome synagogue. (There is a precedent here, Pope Paul VI visited Israel in 1964, and not once during his stay in the country did he ever pronounce the name Israel.) It was right and good of the pope to denounce anti-Semitism. But anti-Semitism is the "Jewish problem" of yesterday. Anti-Zionism—the threat to the safety and legitimacy of Israel—is the Jewish problem of today.

The pope addressed the wrong Jewish problem because he implicitly took the view in his synagogue speech that Jews are exclusively a religious community. Jews have never thought so. They have always considered themselves a people.

To address Jews purely as a religious community is to deny their peoplehood. The pope obviously does so without malice. But others do so with malice. The charter of the PLO calls for the eradication of Israel and presents (Article 20) as a justification the claim that Jews belong to a religion, not a people. And religions have no claim to territory. (An awkward proposition, by the way, when applied to Vatican City.)

In 1982 the pope received the guardian of that charter, Yasser Arafat, which is bad enough. But ignoring Israel rhetorically and refusing to recognize Israel diplomatically compounds the injury. It gives unfortunate, if inadvertent, reinforcement to the premise that Jewish peoplehood is a fiction and thus Jewish statehood an error or worse.

After nearly 2,000 years of Christian anti-Semitism—the "discrimination, unjustified limitation of religious freedom, oppression" which the pope deplored in his Rome speech—something more is needed than a call for mutual tolerance between Catholic and Jew. That something is recognition of Israel, now the hinge of Jewish life and hope. The least one can do for a "dearly beloved brother" is recognize what is most dear to him.

# CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY LABOR LAW AMENDMENTS OF 1985

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1986

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 281), to amend the National Labor Relations Act to increase the stability of collective bargaining in the building and construction industry.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the Construction Industry Labor Law Amendments, H.R. 281, which will remedy certain adverse decisions of the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB] with

regard to the construction industry. From the earliest days of the Wagner Act in 1935, it was recognized that union election procedures designed for the industrial workplace could not be directly transferred to the construction industry. A 1959 amendment to the act, the Landrum-Griffin Act, permitted prehire agreements and was intended to provide workers in the construction industry with an effective opportunity to secure union representation.

Union certification procedures, which are used in other industries covered by the National Labor Relations Act, are usually impractical in the construction industry because workers are constantly working at different job sites, and projects may be completed before a certification election can be held. For this reason, current law permits employers and unions to enter into "prehire" agreements prior to construction and the hiring of employees. Under these agreements, an employer and a union agree that work will be performed in accordance with a union contract.

In recent years, however, two separate sets of NLRB decisions have developed which erode the ability of construction workers to secure and retain the protections of collective bargaining. One set of cases has permitted the wholesale repudiation of lawful prehire collective bargaining agreements. The other set allows the avoidance of collective bargaining agreements through corporate shell games.

Under one set of cases, the Board held that employers may repudiate valid prehire agreements at will unless the union can prove that the employer has a stable work force in which it has established a majority support, or can demonstrate majority support on each separate job site. But stable work forces are a rarity in this industry, which was the reason for the original prehire amendment in 1959.

In the second set of cases, the Board permits the avoidance of lawful collective bargaining agreements through the use of double-breasted companies. A typical example is company A, which has a collective bargaining agreement with a union, sets up a related company—company B—which it operates on a nonunion basis. In some cases, most of the work formerly done by company A is now done by company B. In other situations, company A may go out of business altogether.

The Board placed its imprimatur on this double-breasting device, which then spawned an ever-growing use of this technique for avoiding lawful contracts. The structural characteristics of the construction industry leaves workers defenseless to such corporate manipulations. The project-by-project ebb and flow of the employment relationship allows for corporate restructuring schemes and disappearing acts with the greatest of ease.

To remedy these problems, the construction industry labor law amendments specify that multiple construction firms should be considered a single employer if there is a direct or indirect common ownership, management, or control among the nominally separate businesses engaged in the same or similar work. It requires such employers to apply the terms of a collective bargaining agreement to all of their related entities within the geographical area covered by the agreement.

Collective bargaining agreements will not be imposed on truly separate or independent companies. Instead, the bill requires that

common ownership, management and control be considered in determining whether two or more companies should be considered a single employer. The bill would apply only to companies that perform similar work in the construction industry. The fact that one company has a small interest in another, or that an individual company has dealings with the other company would not be sufficient to declare two companies a single employer. The bill will, however, prevent a company with union workers from setting up another non-union company to perform the same work.

The bill merely prohibits employers or unions from repudiating agreements, which both have agreed to, before their expiration. It does not expand the existing authority to make prehire agreements in the construction industry, and it does not impose a union on employees against their will. Employees would be allowed to decertify a union which represents them, but neither they nor the employer would be permitted to break an agreement into which both entered freely. The bill guarantees that after both parties have already reached agreement, a company cannot break prehire agreements at will, and force the unions to demonstrate majority support through a union certification election on every job site.

I believe this legislation addresses the unique collective bargaining complications inherent in the construction industry. The unusual nature of collective bargaining in the construction industry is no different today than it was 27 years ago. Yet, this bill does not grant new or expanded considerations to construction workers, but merely returns us—and the NLRB—to the original intent of Congress when it passed the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this long overdue legislation.

## LEGISLATION PROHIBITING THE TRANSFER OF STINGERS

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, Late last month, Congress learned that the Reagan administration had reversed longstanding policy by deciding to furnish highly sophisticated U.S. military equipment as part of covert operations overseas. According to recent news reports, the administration plans to include Stinger missiles in this new "arsenal for democracy."

I adamantly oppose this plan and along with my colleague, Congressman DICK DURBIN, have introduced legislation to prohibit the sale or transfer of Stinger missiles to foreign paramilitary forces.

At a time when the United States is fighting an undeclared war against terrorism, worldwide, we simply cannot afford to embark on a policy that carries a risk that Stinger missiles will fall into the hands of terrorists.

The Stinger is not some outdated weapon cluttering up Pentagon warehouses. It is state-of-the-art U.S. technology, and what's more, it's a valuable weapon our own soldiers could use more of.

The Stinger works so well that when the United States supplies this weapon to Saudi



E 1266

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

April 18, 1986

Arabia in 1984, we insisted on setting strict conditions for its use. Yet, with no conditions, news reports indicate that the White House has apparently approved shipment of Stingers to guerrilla groups in Angola and Afghanistan, even though they have concluded that Stingers are too sophisticated for use by the Contras in Nicaragua.

If Congress worried about sending Stingers to a sovereign government, we should be doubly worried about supplying this weapon to guerrilla groups with shifting alliances—and shifting fortunes.

Stingers are small, they're effective and they don't require maintenance. They're a top-flight military weapon—and a perfect tool for terrorists. A Stinger would be worth its weight in gold to a madman like Muammar Qadhafi.

And that's the problem. The new administration policy includes no guarantee that Stingers won't be transferred or taken from a guerrilla group our Government is supporting and given to a terrorist group we abhor. In fact, we doubt that there's any way to guarantee against it, and that's why the administration's plan is so dangerous.

In the past 12 months, we have seen terrorists pick airports, airline offices, and commercial jetliners as targets. Hundreds of people have been killed in these attacks, scores more wounded. With Stingers as part of the equation, we might as well forget about ever being able to protect the freedom of air travel.

Stingers could be easily concealed in urban areas, and because of their long range, used there against commercial airliners. Forget efforts to upgrade airport security. Metal detectors and baggage checks will offer no protection against a terrorist attack with a Stinger.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have heard time and again from administration witnesses about the need to keep U.S. military technology from falling into the wrong hands. I have heard time and again of the need to fund and initiate a more aggressive policy to combat terrorism.

Supplying Stingers to paramilitary groups that could be easily penetrated by agents of the Soviets or of Qadhafi, does not make sense. Sale or transfer of Stingers should only be approved to meet the most vital national security needs of the United States.

By supplying Stingers as part of covert operations, the administration is increasing the chances that the Soviets, or some terrorist group, will steal one of our most effective military weapons.

I am not quarreling, in this bill, with the merits of current United States policy in Angola and Afghanistan. That's a separate issue. My sole concern is that supplying Stingers as part and parcel of these operations poses a terrorist threat to commercial air safety.

To guard against this threat, my legislation prohibits the transfer of Stingers to guerrilla or paramilitary groups. It does not impinge on the authority of the administration to conduct intelligence or military operations overseas. It does not affect current law regarding U.S. arms sales or transfers to sovereign governments. The sole purpose of the bill is to restrict the transfer of Stingers to guerrilla or paramilitary operations where we have no control over who might ultimately gain control of them, and to thwart even more ruthless attacks on passenger airlines than anything we've seen to date.

## COOLING ON CHILE

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the recent change in attitude of the Reagan Administration toward the dictatorship of General Augusto Pinochet in Chile is a welcome and refreshing one. The administration's policy, until recently, has been one of quiet diplomacy, trying to persuade General Pinochet to relinquish power after 13 years with an occasional gentle nudge. As we are all painfully aware, General Pinochet has not only ignored our nudges, but more importantly, he has ignored the cries of his own people for an early return to democratic rule.

Lately, however, the administration has taken some bold steps to illustrate U.S. frustration with the Government of Chile. It introduced a resolution in the United Nations condemning the violation of human rights in Chile, and it listed Chile as one of the few remaining dictatorships in a largely democratic hemisphere. These are clearly signals that General Pinochet can no longer ignore.

I would like to congratulate the administration for its recent moves in Chile, and to encourage it to take this policy even further. The most powerful leverage that we have over General Pinochet is the millions of dollars in loans to his government pending this year in the multilateral development banks. Let's make it clear—with deeds as well as with words—that the United States stands with the democrats in Chile, not with the dictatorship.

The Washington Post editorial of April 2, the full text of which follows, makes the most cogent argument for an active U.S. policy in support of a return to democracy in Chile: "It is the smart way to fight communism, too."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1986]

## COOLING ON CHILE

The Secretary of State now puts Chile on the list of "odd men out," the surviving dictatorships—Paraguay, Cuba and Nicaragua are the others on his list—in a hemisphere otherwise moving briskly toward democracy. It is the latest in a nearly three-year series of nudges meant to convey official American displeasure with President Augusto Pinochet's style of military rule.

Unfortunately, the nudges are necessary. In 1973 Gen. Pinochet ousted an elected president who had brought Chile to civil war by attempting to push a radical program far beyond the bounds that his narrow mandate (36 percent) could sustain. Gen. Pinochet fashioned a system that now bids to keep him in power for almost a full quarter-century. Under his painfully undemocratic constitution of 1980, the 69-year-old ramrod can have himself elected, in a plebscite without party competition, for a term that would last, if he did, until 1997.

This prospect stirs two different groups of Chileans. Leftists see a continuing dictatorship as an opportunity to get back into revolutionary struggle. Centrists see it as a deadly obstacle to Chile's return to democracy. President Pinochet, in the name of resisting the violent communist left, restrains and oppresses the center. The left profits.

For a while after taking office, President Reagan experimented with soft gestures and quiet persuasion. The results were disappointing, and he has turned to public criticism of the regime's continuing abuses and

open encouragement of an accelerated return to democracy. In practical terms, that means legalizing the nonviolent parties and holding real elections under a formula other than the one by which President Pinochet flouts Chile's established democratic traditions now.

The administration had this policy in train well before the changes in Haiti and the Philippines made people aware of the possibilities and benefits of a conservative administration's efforts to democratize right-wing regimes. Recently the administration added a rhetorical flourish to this policy with a brief but eye-catching pledge to "oppose tyranny in whatever form, whether of the left or the right," in a pronouncement on regional security.

Chile is the right country for careful American concern. The United States had at least an indirect hand in the tragedy that befell it in the 1970s; it still enjoys an influence in the 1980s. American favor and acceptance can be put to good use as inducements for Chile's return to the democratic path. It is the smart way to fight communism too.

## LAKESHORE RESIDENTS NEED RELIEF NOW FROM HIGH LAKE LEVELS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all aware of the devastation and hardships which have been imposed on residents living near the Great Lakes as a result of the high lake levels. Because every forecast points to continued high levels at least through the summer, with no real relief in sight, our constituents will continue to wonder and worry about when the next storm or strong winds will hit, eating away at their property or destroying their homes and belongings.

My own constituents, living on the shores of Lake Erie, have been trying to cope with rising lake levels for the last several years. Many have seen their yards, piers, and stately old trees slowly, but inexorably, disappear. Then, a storm last December devastated the area. While Lake Erie dropped by eight feet at Toledo, OH, my constituents bore the brunt of an 8-foot rise in the lake at Buffalo.

The December storm caused massive amounts of damage. Homes were destroyed or severely damaged, personal belongings were lost, breakwalls were demolished, and the lake continued to lap ominously close to the peoples' homes. And, perhaps worst of all, is the knowledge that this kind of storm, with the accompanying devastation, could easily strike again. Unless you have lived through such an experience, I am sure most people can only guess at the heartbreak and trauma of such a disaster.

It has been frustrating to all of us to realize that there are few Federal or State programs established to deal with shoreline erosion and the potential flooding caused by high lake levels, combined with these storms. It also has been frustrating to realize that there is no quick, easy solution to the problem of high lake levels. There is no plug at the bottom of the lakes that we can pull so that the lake levels will subside overnight.